



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,041	04/08/2004	Colin T. Metcalfe	50180	9253

22929 7590 09/21/2004

SUE Z. SHAPER, P.C.  
1800 WEST LOOP SOUTH  
SUITE 750  
HOUSTON, TX 77027

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ARK, DARREN W

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3643

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/821,041	METCALFE, COLIN T. <i>SI</i>
	Examiner Darren W. Ark	Art Unit 3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Inventorship*

1. The Examiner would like to indicate that there are issues with the inventorship in this application since the inventors of U.S. Pat. Application 09/736023 of Howse et al. have not signed and execute the Oath filed 5/17/2004 and that Mr. Colin T. Metcalfe represents an entirely new inventor whose was not a patentee on U.S. Pat. Application 09/736023. Therefore this cannot be considered to be a properly executed Continuation of U.S. Pat. Application No. 09/736023.

### *Double Patenting*

2. Claims 15-27 of this application conflict with claims 15-27 of Application No. 09/736023. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

Art Unit: 3643

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 15-27 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 15-27 of copending Application No. 09/736023. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 15, 16, 18-28 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 15, line 3, "theron" should be changed to "thereon".

Claim 23, line 2, second occurrence of "the" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In regard to claim 1, the specification and figures do not disclose a method of killing or trapping pests using merely the composition as claimed. The basic structure of the trap used to in a "method of trapping" should be recited since such is supported in the figures and specification.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-14, 17, 23-28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In regard to claims 1-14, these claims do not set forth any positive method steps to perform "A method of trapping and/or killing pests" and therefore it is unclear as to what method applicant is intending to encompass. A method claim is indefinite if it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. In order to "trap" insects the use of some sort of trap structure (ie. housing) must be recited.

In regard to claim 1, the term "such as" renders the claim vague and indefinite since it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

In regard to claims 1, 17, and 23, the phrase "containing or consisting of" renders the claim vague and indefinite.

In regard to claim 28, the phrase "as claimed in any one of claims 13 to 20" renders the claim vague and indefinite since it unclear exactly what is being claimed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Geary 3,162,573.

Geary discloses a pesticidal composition (see Example 15; also see claims 13, 14) including particles (pellets) comprising a magnetic material (colloidal iron powder which is capable of being acted upon by a magnet) in admixture with a pesticide or behavior modifying chemical (see col. 3), or particles of a magnetic material coated with a pesticide or behavior modifying chemical (all components placed within a resin).

12. Claims 1-14, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Price et al. 5,492,696.

Price et al. discloses a pesticidal composition in particulate form (microtubules) comprising particles containing magnetic material (iron; see col. 18, lines 38-55) in admixture with a pesticide or behaviour modifying chemical (see col. 18, lines 17-37).

In regard to claim 2, see col. 7, lines 27-32.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Darren W. Ark whose telephone number is (703) 305-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on (703) 308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Darren W. Ark  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3643

DWA